

## REMARKS

Claims 11-29 have been canceled. Claims 1-10 and 30-39 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claim 1 has been amended.

The phrase "computer program code for" is inserted to the second and third recited steps of Claim 1 to be consistent with the first recited step of Claim 1. No new matter has been added.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 30-31, 34-36 and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Vaidya* (US 6,279,113) in view of *Hyppönen et al.* (US 6,577,920). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

*Vaidya* is related to a method for detecting intrusion attempts by monitoring for attack signatures. Although the claimed invention also has a similar element of performing virus detection by identifying virus signatures, the claimed steps are different from *Vaidya*'s teachings because the claimed invention is directed to solving a different problem from that of *Vaidya*.

For example, on page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed computer program code for categorizing is disclosed by *Vaidya* in the Abstract and col. 3, lines 12-16. The Examiner characterizes *Vaidya*'s network object as the claimed executing agent, and seems to further characterize *Vaidya*'s attack signature profiles as the claimed virus signatures. According to *Vaidya*, "attack signature profiles are organized into sets of attack signature profiles which are assigned to network objects based on security requirements of the network objects" (col. 3, lines 28-30). In addition, *Vaidya*'s detection is based on data addressed to one of the network objects. Basically, "[u]pon detecting data addressed to one of the network objects, a set of signature profiles corresponding to that network object is access from the signature profile memory based on the associated data" (col. 3, lines 42-44). Furthermore, "[a]t least one attack signature profile from the set of profiles is processed to determine if the data address to the network object is associated with a network intrusion" (col. 3, line 44-47).

In contrast, Claim 30 (and similarly Claim 1) recites a step of "in response to said target file being opened by said associated executing agent, scanning contents of said target file for viruses by applying virus signatures stored in said subset of said plurality of said anti-virus sets associated with said executing agent." In other words, the claimed scanning is triggered by a target file being opened by an associated executing agent (and not triggered by an access to a network object as taught by *Vaidya*). In addition, the claimed target file, which is associated with an executing agent, is not taught or suggested by *Vaidya* and *Hyppönen*.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed scanning step is disclosed by *Hyppönen* in col. 3, lines 14-20. In col. 3, lines 14-20, *Hyppönen* teaches that a first database is defined to contain known macro virus signatures, a second database is defined to contain known and certified commercial macro signatures, and a third database is defined to contain known and certified local macro signatures. Thus, only the first database of *Hyppönen*, which is defined to contain known macro virus signatures, seems to be relevant to the claimed invention. Since *Hyppönen* has only one database that is relevant to the claimed invention, *Hyppönen* does not teach or suggest "said plurality of said anti-virus sets associated with said executing agent" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Because the cited references, whether separately or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 and 30-39 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 30 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. **50-3533**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS